DCCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 005 UD 009 315

AUTHOR Jenkins, William C.; Phillips, Edna M.
TITLE Special Primary Programs in Five Schools. Evaluatien of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City, 1967-68.
INSTITUTION Center fcr Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Educational Research Committee.
Spons Agency New Ycrk City Board of Educatien, Ercoklyn, N.Y.
Report No CUE-A-C8E
Pub Date Cct 68
Note 72p.

EDRS Price EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.70
Descriptcrs Academic Achievement, Achievement Tests, Class Size, Depressed Areas (Gecgraphic), *Early Childhood Education, Elementary Schccl Students, Kindergarten Children, *Negro Students, Parent Participation, *Puerto Ricans, *Small Classes, Urban Slums
Identifiers *Elementary Secondary Educatien Act Title I, ESEA Title I Prcgrams, New York City

Abstract

This kindergarten through grade 2 prcgram, intended tc prevent the develcpment cf educatienal deficits, prcpcsed to utilize the main features of the Mcre Effective Schccls and the All Day Neighbcrhood Schools prcgrams in order tc (1) increase the academic level cf children in poverty areas, (2) involve the parents in that primary cbjective, and (3) provide liaison with ether grades in school. Class size was reduced tc 15 pupils for kindergarten and first grade, and tc 20 for the secend grade. The five special primary schools served a tctal of 2,336 children, 99 percent of whem were Negrc, and one percent Puerto Rican. No systematic quantitative differences were fcund between perfcrmance in these schools and the several baseline comparison schools. Hcwever, the improved qualitative benefits resulting frcm reduced class size suggest definite advantages potentially accruing to the facilities cf the Special Primary Prcgram. Sample questicnnaire and interview forms used in the evaluation are appended. (EM)

New York City - General

Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City 1967-68

Project No. 06E68

SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRA IN FIVE SCHOOLS

by William O. Jenkins
and Edna M. Phillips

November 1968

The Center for Urban Education

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAMS IN FIVE SCHOOLS

William O. Jenkins

and

Edna M. Phillips

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1967-68 school year.

Educational Research Committee

October 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

A. Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the Special Primary Program (SPP) in Five Schools. The program proposes to utilize the main features of two existing programs, the More Effective Schools (MES) and the All Day Neighborhood Schools (ADNS), in order to increase the academic level of children in poverty areas and to involve the parents in that primary objective.

B. Description of the Project

The Special Primary Program (SPP) as originally described by the Board of Education in September 1968, aims:

1. To raise the academic level of children.

2. To involve parents in the reading program.

3. To provide liaison with other grades in school.

To achieve these objectives, the following specific implementations are proposed:

1. A reduction in class size to 15 pupils for kindergarten and first grade, and to 20 for the second grade.

2. An increase in the size of the teaching staff by the addition of early childhood teachers and grade coordinators.

3. An increase in the psychological and guidance services along with the use of paraprofessionals who live in communities around the five schools.

4. Assignment of subject-matter specialists to facilitate the program as well as to participate in the After School Study Center, a two-hour extension of the school day.

The Board of Education described the program as follows:

> "In effect, the program in these five schools will combine the significant features of MES and ADNS in a massive effort: to raise the academic level of the children in poverty areas by special emphasis on a preventive program in prekindergarten through grade two; to involve parents in a meaningful way

so that they may become partners in promoting optimum academic achievement; to provide liaison with other grades in school so that an ongoing program of academic emphasis may be maintained."

The expansion of the school day, from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M., with an enlarged teaching staff and school aides, so as to provide additional instructional, remedial, and recreational facilities, is based on similar provisions in the ADNS program. Other features, including increased guidance and psychological services, and provision of special teaching and other personnel are characteristic of both the MES and the ADNS programs.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION DESIGN

A. Evaluation Design and Goals

In line with the objectives, goals, and procedures of the Special Primary Program, the evaluation design calls for the following steps:

1. A determination of the extent to which the program as outlined in the initial project description is actually in operation.

2. An assessment of the children, including consideration of academic achievement and progress in acquisition of knowledge, comparison with children not included in this Special Primary Program, and indications of the children's participation in and reactions to the program.

3. A report on staff performance covering the role of teachers in the classroom, the role of the grade coordinators, the function of the various aides, specific coordination features of the program, and reactions of staff and administrative personnel.

4. An evaluation, obtained by interviewing selected parents, of parental involvement in and reactions to the program.

5. An examination of liaison with other grades and the role of the grade coordinator.

6. An evaluation of the implementation and functioning of the After School Study Center through observation and interviews with administrators, teachers, and parents of children involved.

7. An examination of the planning for the program.

A brief comment is warranted concerning the more immediate goals of preschool and early-school intervention programs in terms of ultimate objectives. The first objective involves a "bootstrapping" operation of cultural, artistic, and literary enrichment to bring the economically and culturally impoverished child somewhat nearer the level of the middle-class child. This phase involves teaching the child specific skills and reactions to particular stimulus materials. Over and beyond that acquisition, there would seem to be a more generic, ultimate goal, namely, instilling in the child the habit of learning to learn and to generalize or transfer. The child would then, on his own, seek out knowledge and carry over habit patterns from past experience.

The Special Primary Program, in some of the schools, follows along the lines discussed, with emphasis not only on the acquisition of specific skills, but also on building the more general habit patterns.

B. Areas for Specific Evaluation

Data were collected in the following areas:

1. Academic achievement of the children. Here the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) were employed in grade two, and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (GMRT) in grades one and two.

2. Development achievement of the children. The New York Child Development Scales (CDS) were administered in prekindergarten, kindergarten, and grades one and two.

3. Implementation of the program. An interview guide for use with principals and assistant principals was developed to obtain this information.

4. Parental participation. A special Parent Inventory was developed that was supplemented by information from the principals and the teachers.

5. Community involvement. Information on this point was obtained from principals and staff.

6. Teacher reaction. A Teacher Questionnaire was constructed. In addition, the Individual Lesson Observation Report was taken over from MES[1] and employed to gather information about both teachers and children.

7. After School Study Center (ASSC). An ASSC Observation Guide was developed and supplemented by interview information from the principals and teachers.

C. Description of the Specific Instruments

1. Nine specific comparison schools. The five Special Program Schools were compared among themselves, but it was considered efficacious to make external comparisons of test performance with schools not involved in this program. The design for analysis involved selecting schools geographically and ethnically similar to each of the five SPP schools. Thus, an attempt was made to obtain an essential baseline for each school from which the effects

---

[1] Fox, David J., Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program, (New York: Center for Urban Education, September 1967).

of the special program could be assessed. Nine such schools in all were selected.

Because information for all nine schools was not complete, it was necessary to use different groups of schools for different data. Five paired comparison schools were used for analysis of MAT scores. Five were used for analysis of the Gates-MacGinitie scores. In one comparison school, both scores could be analyzed. Thus, data from all nine paired comparison schools were examined.

2. Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT). This widely used achievement test is described by its authors as follows:

> "This general achievement series offers comprehensive and dependable measurement of the progress of a pupil through his entire elementary school career, providing an analysis and record of his developing mastery of essential skills and information.
>
> "Thorough analysis of current courses of study and instructional materials, and of the thinking of professional leaders in elementary education, identified the objectives to be measured. More than 15,000 test exercises, all prepared especially for these forms, were developed to meet rigorous specifications. Experimental tryout furnished the empirical basis for selection of test material.
>
> "Test scores are made meaningful through conventional grade equivalents, percentiles, or the simplified stanine scores. These scores point directly and quickly to pupil status in the skill or content areas, and suggest appropriate types of instructional, curricular, or guidance action."

Word-knowledge and reading scores along with the average of the two measures were obtained in raw and grade-equivalent units from the school rosters provided by the Board of Education. Since the two individual scores correlated substantially, only the average grade-equivalent score was employed in analysis. The MAT was administered to all second-grade pupils in April 1968, and the rosters became available for statistical treatment in late May. The comparison schools were used as measures.

3. The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (GMRT). This instrument was employed with the first and second grade of the five SPP Schools.

It consists of two basic parts: Vocabulary and Comprehension. These are described by the developers as follows:

> "The Vocabulary Test samples the child's ability to recognize or analyze isolated words. It consists of 48 exercises, each of which contains four printed words and a picture illustrating the meaning of one of the words. The child's task is to circle the word that best corresponds to the picture. The first exercises are composed of easy and commonly used words, grouped with words selected to be only slightly similar or confusing. Gradually the words become less easy and common and are presented with words more similar in details and general appearance.
>
> "The Comprehension Test measures the child's ability to read and understand whole sentences and paragraphs. This ability includes many skills not involved in the mere ability to recognize words. The child must grasp the total thought clearly if he is to answer correctly. The test contains 34 passages of increasing length and difficulty. Each passage is accompanied by a panel of four pictures. The child's task is to mark the picture that best illustrates the meaning of the passage or that answers the question in the passage."

As in the case of the MAT, comparison schools were selected so that a baseline was potentially available from which to measure any effects of the SPP.

The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests were administered at several SPP schools in February 1968, but since data were not available for all SPP and the comparison schools, this information could not be used as a preprogram measure.

4. New York Child Development Scales (CDS).[2] This scale has much in common with the Vineland scales[3] for assessing developmental maturity in infants and preschool children. It also relates to the

---

[2]New York Child Development Scale, (Board of Education of the City of New York, Bureau of Educational Research, 1950).

[3]Vineland Social Maturity Scale, (Educational Testing Service, 1953).

Gesell scales[4] for early childhood behavior. It is not a measure of academic achievement, but rather focuses on gross development in language, motor activities, interpersonal relations, and independence. Thus it is designed for assessment of individual strengths and weaknesses in areas that form the context in which academic achievement progresses. As such it was thought that the CDS might throw light on behaviors related to academic achievement, but not directly reflected in the instruments employed to measure it.

The instrument is described in the manual as follows:

> "In order to plan a program to meet the child's needs, the teacher tries to find out all she can about him... The New York Child Development Scales have been constructed to help her make systematic observations of the child's behavior in a few selected areas and to help her utilize these observations in planning his program and guiding his growth. Four scales are available:
>
> Scale A: Personal Independence
> Scale B: Interpersonal Relations
> Scale L: Language
> Scale M: Motor Development
>
> "The scales are designed for use with individual children of chronological ages four through seven. Each scale yields a rating for the child in comparison with children of his own age. The possible ratings are: (1) Markedly Above Average, (2) Above Average, (3) Average, (4) Below Average, (5) Markedly Below Average. Scale A: Personal Independence and Scale B: Interpersonal Relations measure closely related aspects of development and may be used as a unit. Scale L: Language and Scale M: Motor Development are more independent instruments and may be used separately or in conjunction with the others."

The original plan was to have the CDS executed by two independent teachers on a randomly selected sample of 15 children from each level (pre-K, K, 1, and 2) for each of the five SPP and five control, baseline schools. In practice, only one comparison school could be obtained and, in the SPP schools, various complications arose that will be noted later.

---

[4] Gesell Developmental Schedules, (Psychological Corporation, 1949).

A basic point is clear: some measure of behavior outside and independent (at least in part) of the direct achievement context is needed. It was hoped that the CDS would provide a small springboard from which increased efforts in this direction would take off. The ideal, of course, is assessment of the habits of learning and generalization.

5. Principal's Interview Outline. The complete guide to interview of the principals and assistant principals is provided in Appendix B. The focal point of the interview was a determination of the degree of implementation of the Special Primary Program. That is to say, the aim was to find out concordance between the stated goals and budget specifications on the one hand and actual practice on the other. Specific questions concerned, for example, staff, their allocation and function, the role of the grade coordinator, the function of the clinical team, community relations and parental involvement, and the details of the After School Study Center. All principals were interviewed at least twice and in several instances as many as six times. In addition, assistant principals and grade coordinators either were included in the principals' interviews or were interviewed separately at all five schools.

6. The After School Study Center (ASSC) Guide. The principal and other participants in the ASSC were interviewed in depth concerning the details of the ASSC program. Such information was sought as the nature of the supervision, content and participation in the ASSC, parental involvement, and administrative provision for evaluating the program. Observations were made in the ASSC setting. A copy is included in Appendix B.

7. Parent Inventory. This instrument dealt directly with parental participation in the regular school program and/or in the ASSC. It also sought to find out about parental knowledge of and participation in specifics such as the child's homework. A copy of this inventory is contained in Appendix B. Ten parents at each school were asked to execute this inventory.

8. Teacher Questionnaire. This was in part an adaptation of a measure developed in one of the schools and was administered to all second-grade teachers at each of the five schools. Its purpose was to obtain demographic information regarding teaching experience, reactions to various aspects of the Special Primary Program, and some regular classroom feedback on those children who were participating in the ASSC program.

D. Basic Factors Contaminating Research Design: Turnover, Confounding, and Unavailability of Pretesting Data

Before describing the five schools involved in the Special Primary Program, three basic problems require discussion. They are

basic because they not only restrict evaluation and assessment but, in a very real sense, can operate to prevent or at least drastically limit the functioning of such a program.

The first is turnover or motility or mobility. The concept has reference to the shifting nature of the within-school sample under evaluation examination. It is close to complete redundancy to comment that a child who comes into the program the day before a measure of program effect is applied, is in no way comparable to a child who has been in the program throughout the school year. Clearly, it behooves the evaluator to consider the status of the child in this regard. If the program has any behavioral impact as indicated by performance on any measure, the child must have had at least minimal exposure to the potential influence of the program. Otherwise it is meaningless to discuss the effects of the program.

There is another, possibly more subtle aspect to the turnover problems, namely, teachers. Participating in the program with one teacher is not the same as participating with a new teacher, or a series of teachers. Adherence to the principle of a "stable sample" may greatly restrict the size of the sample, but it would allow relatively pure effects of the program under scrutiny to emerge.

The second problem is the matter of confounding different programs, which is even more complex than that of turnover. The term "confounding" is used to designate the situation in which more than one program is operating in such a way that the separate effects of each program cannot be disentangled. Suppose, for instance, one school is endowed with program A, a second school with A plus B, and a third with A plus B plus C. If differences emerge when the three schools are compared with the appropriate baseline control schools that lack all three programs, they cannot be clearly attributed to the effects of any particular one of the three programs. Some statistical refinement may help, but in the more complex case where half a dozen programs are involved to varying extents, no amount of statistical manipulation will clarify the picture.

Third, a beforehand measurement is essential so that gain scores can be statistically examined. Such gain scores are basic to the assessment of any academically oriented program in providing proportional changes in knowledge and skill from each child's own baseline. Since gain scores were not available, it affects ability to evaluate.

Matters such as these will be treated in the report, but it should be stressed at this methodological point that such obstacles should be removed at the program planning stages and not left to becloud the evaluations.

E. Criteria of Change

The immediate effects of an intervention program can be measured during and immediately after completion of intervention. Intermediate criteria are also available, such as the degree to which the acquired behavior generalizes and/or transfers to near or remote situations along some similarity continuum, situational or reactional. More ultimate criteria must, of course, be considered. These are usually quite removed in time from the original intervention. For instance, one might expose infants to increasingly complex environmental stimulation, building in more complex reaction patterns. The investigator would have immediately at hand the performance of the child, and he could test, over a period of time, for transfer in a variety of increasingly dissimilar situations. In the long pull he is obligated to check, for example, the child's school performance against those of children not given the early-life treatment.

In this context, we are here dealing with the immediate effects of the Special Primary Program, not with the long-range maturation of influence. The latter is a matter for future evaluation.

F. Demographic Description of the Five Special Primary Program Schools

Table 1 summarizes certain demographic features of the five schools involved in the Special Primary Program. (SPP schools [five] are coded A through E; comparison schools [nine], F through N.) The outstanding feature of this table is diversity. Marked differences among schools appear in almost every regard. The schools were, however, homogeneous in regard to socioeconomic status, with most children in all schools drawn from families toward the lower end of the scale. They were also similar with regard to turnover in pupils. The ethnicity figures of this table, along with geographical location, were employed in selecting matching schools for comparison on certain measures, such as the MAT and the Gates-MacGinitie Tests.

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY SCHOOLS
OCTOBER 1967[a]

	A	B	C	D	E	Total
Latest Enrollment Spring 1968						
Pre-K	59	55	59	0	23	196
K	215	156	135	82	71	659
1	294	172	123	94	55	738
2	275	187	129	90	62	743
Total	843	570	446	266	211	2,336
Pupil Turnover Rate Based on Opening Register (Pre-K through Gr. 2)	187%	47%	113%	129%	72%	
ASSC Register	125	220	330	225	200	1,100
ASSC Attendance (Grades 2 - 6)	66%	30%	66%	67%	30%	
Ethnicity						
Negro	64%	92%	81%	55%	99%	
Puerto Rican	34.5%	8%	19%	22%	1%	
Other	1.5%	0%	0%	23%	0%	

[a]Board of Education, Ethnic Survey of October 1967.

G. Recapitulation

The focus of the Special Primary Program in Five Schools was on increased academic achievement by adding teachers and grade coordinators. Parental involvement was sought. Two kinds of evaluation were involved: quantitative by way of standardized tests and inventories and qualitative by interviews and questionnaires. Observations were employed for both. Special considerations include the goals of the program, the appropriateness of the measures, change in performance over time, turnover, confounding,and long-range assessment of program effects.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS: QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENTS

A. The Metropolitan Achievement Tests in the Second Grade

The MAT was administered to a total of 653 students in 33 second-grade classes in the five SPP schools. As noted previously, comparable schools that did not involve the SSP were selected on geographical and ethnic bases. From these schools a sample of 38 second-grade classes involving 864 pupils was selected. The median number of pupils per class in the two sets of five schools was about the same (18), but the spread in class enrollment was appreciably different. The range in the five SPP schools was from six to 32, while the corresponding figures were 11 to 58 in the five comparison schools. For various reasons beyond our control the numbers in Table 2 do not always agree with these figures. Some classes were removed from consideration in the interests of a more stable sample. Pupils who were in the school for too brief a period to be considered as part of the stable school population were also eliminated from the analysis. In order to achieve a relatively stable sample, classes were excluded that contained fewer than ten students.

Of possibly greater import, only those classes in the SPP schools were included for analysis where the children had been in the program for most of the school year. Spot checking of teacher turnover suggested that it was relatively small in this situation and therefore played a minor role.

Unfortunately, this care in sample selection could not be applied to the comparison schools. While this factor is not to be overlooked as a potential source of uncontrolled variation, the outcome as shown below is such that it appears to have made little difference.

Table 2 contains a summary of the data from the administration of the MAT in the second grade of the five SPP schools and the five comparison schools. To simplify presentation, the mean grade equivalents are given for the highest, medial, and lowest class in each school. Overall figures for the two sets of five schools are included (the SPP schools and the non-SPP schools).

It is clear from this representation that (given the critical qualifications of the material) the two sets of five schools performed at about the same level in the middle range with a very slight tendency for the SPP school pupils to score a little higher at the lower and upper groupings. These trends are extremely slight and detailed statistical analysis revealed no significant findings in the data of Table 2 or the data for all classes from all ten schools.

TABLE 2

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES IN THE SECOND GRADE IN FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS AND FIVE COMPARISON SCHOOLS

School	N	Highest Class	Middle Class	Lowest Class	Number of Classes
FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS					
A	208	2.52	1.83	1.45	9
B	105	3.61	2.33	1.70	5
C	84	2.81	2.09	1.97	6
D	77	3.06	2.45	1.95	3
E	84	2.71	1.88	1.83	3
Overall	558[a]	2.81	2.09	1.83	26
FIVE NON-SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS					
F	159	1.94	1.84	1.64	3
G	54	2.38	2.14	1.65	4
H	234	2.92	2.09	1.41	13
I	158	2.06	1.70	1.51	6
J	105	3.05	2.36	2.08	4
Overall	710	2.38	2.09	1.64	30

[a]These numbers represent only fairly stable classes with registers of ten or over. Classes with registers below ten were eliminated from this test. Thus, only 56 (of the total of 65 second-grade classes) were tested.

Another basic question can be asked concerning performance on a standardized test such as the MAT. How did the children perform relative to grade norms? Table 2 indicates that a majority of classes scored below the grade norm of 2.7 for second graders at this stage of training. To check this point a count was made school-by-school of the number of classes exceeding the norm of 2.7. The outcome details of this procedure are in Table 3, where it can be seen that very few classes in either the SPP group or the comparison group reached standard. Only eight of the total of 65 classes involved so achieved, four from the SPP schools and four from the control schools. Thus, underachievement on this test in these schools is the norm.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF SECOND GRADE CLASSES REACHING OR EXCEEDING A GRADE EQUIVALENT OF 2.7 ON THE MAT IN FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS AND FIVE COMPARISON SCHOOLS[a]

Special Primary Program Schools		Comparison Schools	
A	0/10	F	0/3
B	1/10	G	0/4
C	1/5	H	2/17
D	1/3	I	1/5
E	1/3	J	1/5
All Schools	4/31		4/34
Per Cent	12.9		8.8
Overall	8/65[b]		
Per Cent	12.3		

[a]The denominator is the total number of classes involved.

[b]This total (65) differs from the total (56) indicated in Table 2 because low register classes with fewer than ten pupils were not eliminated from consideration here as they were in that table (2).

B. Turnover and MAT Performance

Since environmental change has an established decremental effect on any specific class of behavior, it was deemed important to check test performance against length of stay in school. A second-grade sample was available from School A that entered school in February 1967 (N=14), and another sample that entered in September 1967 or later (N=14). Cutoff scores at a grade equivalent of 2.8 or higher and 1.2 and lower were selected as representing high and low achievement. The two-by-two sort is shown in the upper portion of Table 4. The intensity of association between date of entry and achievement is reflected in a phi coefficient of .39, significant for this size sample at the .02 level. The trend is clear: early entry coupled with stability generates higher achievement.

The bottom portion of Table 4 presents the same sort of analysis for a fifth grade at School H. Here the N's are substantial and while the degree of covariation is less, the trend is the same. Again, longer stay in the same school is associated with a higher level of test achievement.

The effects demonstrated in Table 4 are not of large magnitude. Nonetheless they warrant consideration and further support the contention that a stable sample is required to reflect the effects of programmatic treatment. It is demonstrably meaningless to conjoin children with a long duration of exposure to a program with those of brief exposure. Investigators must consider this source of variation in sample selection.

TABLE 4

THE PROBLEM OF PUPIL TURNOVER: LENGTH OF PUPILS' SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND MAT PERFORMANCE IN TWO SCHOOLS[a]

	SECOND GRADE SCHOOL A			
	MAT GE[b] Greater Than 2.8	MAT GE Less Than 1.2	Total	
Entered School February 1967	12	2	14	$\phi = .39$
Entered School September 1967 or Later	7	7	14	$p = .02$
Total	19	9	28	

	FIFTH GRADE SCHOOL H					
	MAT GE Greater Than Mean		MAT GE Less Than Mean		Total	
Entered School 1967-1968	17	(19.8%)	69	(80.2%)	86	$\phi = .21$
Entered School 1962-1967	36	(38.7%)	57	(61.3%)	93	$p = .002$
Total	53		126		179	

[a]Entries represent number of pupils.

[b]GE = Grade Equivalent.

C. The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests in the First Grade

The available findings for the first grade are summarized in Table 5 for the five SPP schools and five paired schools which were deemed comparable in geographic location and ethnic composition. Raw scores are shown separately for vocabulary and comprehension and are presented with grade equivalents on the last line of each section of the table.

TABLE 5

GATES-MACGINITIE READING TEST SCORES IN THE FIRST GRADE
IN THE FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS
AND FIVE COMPARISON SCHOOLS

School No.		Vocabulary Median	Vocabulary Range	Comprehension Median	Comprehension Range
FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS					
A	256	13.9	0-46	10.0	0-32
B	132	26.5	8-46	18.4	0-34
C	122	29.2	6-48	15.2	2-34
D	90	15.5	2-48	9.4	0-30
E	78	18.8	4-48	11.7	0-28
Overall Raw Score	678	18.6	0-48	12.0	0-34
Overall Grade Equivalent Scores	678	1.38	1.2-3.4	1.47	1.2-3.6
FIVE COMPARISON SCHOOLS					
G	91	25.4	6-46	13.2	2-32
K	147	18.6	0-46	11.6	0-32
L	303	21.9	4-48	12.9	0-32
M	136	28.7	8-48	13.6	2-32
N	156	21.0	2-48	11.9	0-32
Overall Raw Score	833	23.1	0-48	12.5	0-32
Overall Grade Equivalent Scores	833	1.50	1.2-3.4	1.49	1.2-3.6

Inspection of this table clearly indicates an appreciable spread in scores from school to school with little systematic difference emerging across the SPP and comparison schools. Both "count" statistics, and the more traditional modes of analysis yield only one significant difference, namely, differences across

the ten schools. This datum is, of course, expected. While the vocabulary scores on the average favor the comparison schools, it should be noted that two of the three highest scores were in the SPP schools.

Again, a traditional instrument focusing on the acquisition and demonstration of specific skills failed to indicate incremental effects associated with the Special Primary Program.

A more sensitive index of performance would clearly be percentage change from a pre- to a post-measure. Far from complete information was available on the former, so a detailed analysis of gain scores could not be conducted.

To determine level of performance relative to test norms, the pupils of the first-grade classes of the five SPP schools were classified according to the grade equivalent achieved: at 1.9 or below, and above 1.9 for both measures. Only 25 or 4.2 per cent scored a grade equivalent of 2.0 or higher. As in the case of the MAT, performance was consistently below normative grade level.

Essentially, the same picture emerges for the students of the five comparison schools in both vocabulary and comprehension.

D. The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests in the Second Grade

Only grade equivalent scores for the five SPP schools were available. These are contained in Table 6. There are appreciable differences across schools, but these were not statistically significant because of the great within- and across-school variability. For instance, the largest difference in school performance, 1.48 versus 2.16 for vocabulary, must be considered in the setting of the total variability, namely, 1.2 to 5.2. In passing, it might be noted that there is no reason to believe the picture would be changed by the inclusion of comparison schools, from which the results were not available.

TABLE 6

GATES-MACGINITIE READING TEST GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES IN THE SECOND GRADE FOR THE FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS

		Vocabulary		Comprehension	
School	No.	Median	Range	Median	Range
A	236	1.48	1.2-5.0	1.53	1.2-5.0
B	160	2.09	1.2-5.2	1.83	1.2-5.0
C	141	2.16	1.2-5.2	2.14	1.2-5.4
D	87	1.69	1.2-5.2	1.74	1.2-5.4
E	82	1.66	1.2-4.8	1.65	1.2-5.4
Overall	706	1.82	1.2-5.2	1.78	1.2-5.4

As in the first grade, the achievement of 678 children was sorted as exceeding or not exceeding a grade equivalent of 2.9. This indicates that 109 of the 678 pupils whose records could be used in the final analysis of the data attained a grade equivalent of 3.0 or higher. This figure represents 16.2 per cent.

As in the other test instances, gain scores from earlier to later testing would have generated a more complete picture, but the earlier test information was not readily available in complete form.

E. The New York Child Development Scales in Grades Pre-K Through Two

The point has been previously emphasized that an intervention program can follow one of two courses: building in specific skills in reaction to specific stimulus materials or maximizing generalization or transfer. There is obviously no reason a program cannot do both, and this is the course of choice. The New York Child Development Scales (CDS) offer a first step toward a measure of transfer. They constitute essentially check lists covering the child's ability to take care of himself and to get along with children and adults, his capacity for communication, and sensorimotor skills. The teacher, after considerable observation of the child, executes these scales for three levels -- at the child's age, one year younger, and one year older.

The original evaluation plan called for execution of the CDS on two classes of approximately 15 children each, at each of the four grade levels. Each child was to be rated by two independent teachers in each of the five SPP schools, and one comparison school. Because of time and personnel limitations along with other considerations, this plan could not be implemented. Thus, only incomplete information was available. It is, however, basic to present it since it is the first small step toward determining the extent to which the intervention program ingrains habits that carry over to various activities beyond the academic situation. For instance, one might determine the frequency and intensity with which a child seeks out reading material on his own outside of the school situation.

The incomplete returns from this instrument are contained in Table 7. First, it should be noted that there was extremely wide variation in exactness of execution of the scales. Across the board, less than 50 per cent of the returned scales were usable because of variations evident in teacher interpretation of instructions. Next, those that were usable showed enormous variability from rater to rater. For instance, in Table 7, one sample in the first grade shows a median of 39 of a possible 60 points, with a range from 5 to 57, while another sample in a different school has a median of 60, with no spread whatsoever. Such numerical characteristics, of course, prohibit statistical treatment of the data. Within the gross limitations of the data, the main finding is the great individual variability.

TABLE 7

NEW YORK CHILD DEVELOPMENT SCALE TOTAL SCORES IN SELECTED CLASSES IN THE FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS AND ONE COMPARISON SCHOOL[a]

School		Pre K	K	1	2
A	Number	8	10	9	
	Median	36	40	53	---
	Range	16-46	18-57	13-57	
B	Number	19	12		24
	Median	59	59	---	37
	Range	29-60	45-60		7-57
C	Number	7	15	4	
	Median	59	52	60	---
	Range	46-60	21-59	0	
D	Number		19	31	20
	Median	---	47	39	54
	Range		14-60	5-57	38-59
E	Number	10	15	15	6
	Median	36	48	33	50
	Range	19-50	16-57	25-54	18-60
H[a]	Number			32	12
	Median	---	---	58	58
	Range			23-60	46-60

[a]H indicates school used as comparison.

The main point of this section is to indicate the direction that assessment procedures should take with regard to the matter of generalization and transfer of the habits acquired in the school setting to nonacademic situations. Clearly, considerable research emphasis has to be given to instrument development and tryout. The first order of business in this regard must involve a thorough examination, a kind of job analysis, of the nature of the child's activities outside the classroom that might be sensitive to and reflect transfer of skills and habits acquired in the classroom. It may well be that this area is the most significant one for future research dealing with intervention programs in early education and training.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: OBSERVATIONS, INTERVIEWS, AND QUESTIONNAIRES

A. The Evaluation Procedure

The administrative policies that characterized the schools in the study varied so that it became difficult to measure the schools against each other. The educational philosophy and the attitudes of the administrative staff to a large extent determined the atmosphere in each school. Whether the classroom ambience was well structured or over structured, how disciplinary problems were handled, to what extent parental and community involvement were sought -- all these had an effect on teaching, morale, and attitudes.

To obtain an overview of each school and what the SPP meant to it, the program was examined from several points of view, which are discussed in the following sections.

B. Report of Interviews with Principals

In addition to the increased staff and facilities allotted to the Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Special Service Schools, the Special Primary Program in Five Schools was intended "to incorporate the best features of existing programs, such as MES and ADNS, into one coordinated, enriched, unified program." The program in the five schools extended from K to sixth grade, but since a good part of the extra personnel had been allotted to the early childhood grades (e.g., extra teachers to maintain a 1-to-15 pupil-teacher ratio in kindergarten grades, and an additional assistant principal in each school), the evaluation team thought it best to concentrate its efforts on the lower primary grades of each school. The principals and their administrative staffs were interviewed to find out how much of the plan was being carried out, before independent observations of the program in action were made. They were interviewed again during the evaluation to assess their reactions to this pilot program (SPP) within a program (Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Special Service Schools).

1. Implementation of the program. Budget requirements were met with one or two exceptions. Except for those positions for which there is a special license, such as assistant principal and guidance counselor, the principals chose their specialist staffs from among the ranks of their teachers. Grade coordinators and language-art coordinators seemed to present no particular problem, but the position of the community relations coordinator did, in at least two of the schools. In these two schools, principals felt

that these positions should be filled by members of the community rather than by being drawn from the faculty. When qualified personnel were found in the community, they were commanding a higher salary than could be offered them in the schools. So the positions went unfilled.

None of the schools had a full clinical team of a social worker, psychologist, and psychiatrist. Where a social worker was assigned, he was not usually assigned for the number of days allowed in the budget. Toward the end of the year, one school had had the services of a psychiatrist for a few hours. Psychologists were not available at all.

2. Selection of personnel. With the appointment of an additional assistant principal, the burdens of administrative detail were in large measure removed from the principal's responsibility, and he felt freer to devote himself to the training and observation of teachers and to developing new policies for the school.

The grade coordinator served a key function in teacher training and curricular administration, and was therefore vital to each grade. Budgetary limitations were basic to some problems encountered in assignments of SPP coordinators. Coordinators for grades one and two were budgeted from the strengthened Early Childhood Program -- technically, the SPP budget provided for grade three and four coordinators only. Thus, most SPP schools assigned the assistant to principal as grade coordinator for pre-K and kindergarten. There was some reservation on the part of teachers in accepting a supervisor (the assistant to principal is considered part of administration rather than of staff) in the role of coordinator. The strength of the grade coordinator's role lay in his relation to the staff as a peer, with time and ability to give demonstration lessons, to help in the planning and coordinating of lessons, and to lead teacher-training sessions, but without the need to supervise or rate the teachers with whom he worked.

While certain factors such as the ethnic imbalance and the deprived population were qualities common to all the five schools, their staff deployment varied greatly according to their supervisory philosophy and delineation of teaching roles.

While some schools appointed their extra staff with discrimination, others appointed teachers to special positions as a reward for years of service rather than for qualities of leadership and initiative. The teachers' roles were defined differently in the schools. In some instances the language-arts coordinator spent the time teaching in as many classes as could be covered; in others, this person acted as coordinator, defining and explicating to the staff what was to be taught to the pupils. In some schools, the

grade coordinator was occupied with details of scheduling meetings, checking plan books, and preventing teacher conflicts; in others, this person took on the vital role of teacher trainer.

3. Attitudes of the principals toward the program. Questions to principals about so-called "team teaching" brought varied response. Since the Strengthened Early Childhood Program and the SPP were both predicated upon a reduction in pupil-teacher ratio, it became necessary, in instances of space shortage, to assign two primary teachers to one classroom. Each teacher in grade one had her own register of 15 pupils and, in grade two, 20 pupils. This accommodation of two teachers within one classroom brought to the fore many problems related to team teaching. The two-teacher classroom was recognized by all to be an expedient made necessary by lack of space. The difficulties in such an arrangement were many. There were teacher personality conflicts and disagreements about housekeeping habits and the disciplining of the children. In addition, both teachers and children found it distracting to hear two voices and two lessons going on at the same time. On the other hand, the class units were so flexible that it was possible for one teacher to take a few children for special or remedial work, while the other conducted a lesson for the rest of the class. Where the teachers really worked together well, both teachers and principals spoke with genuine enthusiasm about the fluidity of the teaching situation. Both groups, however, would have preferred separate classrooms for the conduct of such an experiment.

One of the bonuses of the Special Primary Program was the extra personnel it provided for the kindergarten classes. This made it possible to increase the session for pre-K and K children from two and one-half hours to three. The principals felt that, for the children involved, this was a true head start. But while no principal would turn down the offer of additional personnel, many implied that the presence of four adults -- two teachers and two aides -- in a class of 15 was often more cumbersome than efficent.

The consensus was that there were two special increments involved in the Special Primary Program over and above the extra services offered by the Strengthened Early Childhood Program. One was the addition of personnel to make possible an expanded kindergarten program. The other was the provision made for an extra grade coordinator in each of the five schools, a role considered to be crucial to teacher training. According to the principals, the colleges did not adequately prepare students for teaching in disadvantaged areas, and teachers have had to cope with these difficult situations by themselves. In one school the average experience of the faculty was one year and eight months. The most practical and efficacious solution was considered to be

on-the-job training, and principals regarded the grade coordinator as the prime teacher trainer.

There was less consensus about the value of the After School Study Center (ASSC), a two-hour extension of the schoolday consisting of clubs and remedial activities. Some principals felt that, for young children, a lengthened schoolday was more exhausting than stimulating. Others were certain that the benefits far outweighed the disadvantages. About one-quarter of the schools' population attended the ASSC. One could not be sure whether attendance was urged by the schools, encouraged or forced by the parents, or accepted by the children for reasons of their own. Details of the ASSC will be discussed later.

Most principals saw true parent involvement as a long-term rather than an immediately realizable goal. They felt that it was too soon to evaluate a process that required much time and effort on the part of both school personnel and parents to effect actual engagement of parents in the learning program. Accordingly, most principals felt frustrated by apparent lack of success to date in achieving the kind of pa- nt involvement they hoped for ultimately.

4. Principals' suggestions. Only those suggestions concurred in by a majority of the principals are incorporated here.

a. Each principal would have wanted more contact with the other schools in this pilot program for an exchange of ideas concerning principles and practices and for the consideration of successes or failures. Only two meetings for these exchanges were held during the year.

b. While refreshments were provided for ASSC students, no provision was made to compensate the custodial staff for cleaning up. The school either made its own provisions or eliminated a refreshment period. This situation should be remedied.

c. The addition of so much nonteaching personnel created confusion within the school, as well as bookkeeping problems. Special help should be provided in the handling of their payrolls.

d. Team teaching could not be fairly evaluated at this time because of space limitations. It was extremely difficult for two teachers, even if they were working harmoniously, to function in the same small classroom meant originally for only one teacher and her class. Two voices were distracting to the children. Different teaching personalities created different demands on the children, causing conflict. Separate classrooms should be provided for the effective implementation of this program.

e. Since appropriated funds for the clinical team were not used because team personnel were unavailable, it would be more practicable for each school to engage a psychiatrist or psychologist on a per-session basis. Many of these professionals, while they are unwilling to tie themselves down for a given number of hours per week, would be willing to see children as needed if they were adequately recompensed.

While there were many criticisms and other suggestions, on the whole, any program which made lower registers possible, and encouraged experimentation, was welcomed. It was too early to tell at the time of the interviews whether achievement tests in reading and arithmetic showed any dramatic improvement as a result of the lower registers, but other improvements (in social behavior and emotional stability) were noted by the staff.

C. Parent Involvement

The five schools had had prior difficulty in getting genuine parents' movements going. Parents, according to staff reports, responded directly to the needs of their own children, not to the broader social needs of the school or the community. A parent would be more likely to attend a meeting where his child was performing, or where his child's specific problem would be discussed.

In four of the five schools the administration found no adequate method of involving parents in large numbers, other than inviting them to meetings where they might see their children perform, or to parent-teacher grade meetings which took up specific subject-matter problems in their children's particular grade.

The fifth school had somewhat more success because, at the outset, they had involved the community. In this school the administrative staff met regularly with a steering committee (an offshoot of the local Community Council) consisting of representatives of parents, teachers, college professors whose training center fed the new teachers to the staff, small businessmen, civil rights organizations, community action people, etc. At these meetings, the community representatives were informed of what was going on in the school, and the school kept in touch with what was going on in the neighborhood. The general school problems became matters for concern in the community. As a result, the school had a large pool of volunteers to draw on, and a more relevant response to general problems.

A selected group of 45 parents (about nine parents in each of the five SPP schools) was questioned concerning their involvement with the school's program, and with the school, in relation to their own children. These parents to whom the questionnaires were addressed, were not a representative sample of the parent population,

since they were either working in the school as aides, had attended a workshop, or had children attending the After School Study Center. The parents to whom the questionnaires were distributed were already involved in school participation, and could therefore be reasonably expected to answer after careful consideration.

Of these 45 parents questioned, 77 per cent were working in the school in some capacity, 53 per cent volunteered their services at least once, 47 per cent had attended workshops, and 43 per cent had children in the school who were attending the After School Study Center.

The questions focused around the role of the parent in establishing and maintaining homework routines and study habits for their children, the role of the school in helping parents with this task, and the extent to which liaison between parent and teacher or school was effective.

Of these parents, 81 per cent said they provided a given time and place where the child could do his homework. Seventy-one per cent checked that the homework assignments were carried out, and 63 per cent actually helped the child with his homework, in effect helping to teach him or reinforcing what he had learned. The majority of the parents thought that the homework assignments were adequate, that is, neither too much nor too little, nor too difficult nor too easy. Almost two-thirds of the parents thought it quite proper for parents to be asked to help teach the child; in fact they thought that the teaching of reading and arithmetic (subject matter) should not be left entirely to the teacher.

All five schools conducted workshops for parents, with varying degrees of success. The workshops discussed such topics as reading methods, new math, child guidance, and problems of early childhood. These were designed to help the parent assist and understand the child. Workshops in English for non-English-speaking parents, sewing, nutrition and crafts were designed to help the parent help himself. The self-help workshops, it was hoped, would bring the parents into the school situation, and indeed these were better attended than the others. Later the parents would be drawn into discussions concerning other problem areas. About half the respondents attended at least one of these workshops. Although they could bring their preschool children during the day to be cared for by a family worker while they attended the workshops, only a few of them could find time to come with any degree of regularity.

Forty-three per cent of the respondents had children who attended the After School Study Center. More than half of them, or 58 per cent, said that the Center had helped their children very much. Their suggestions for improvement included greater involvement of

parents and/or paraprofessionals in the reading program, better articulation between the day school and the ASSC, more adequate instruction to parents in homework supervision, greater stress on phonics and reading, and increased involvement of the community at large.

The profile of an ideally involved parent (of whom there were relatively few) would show that she was interested in what the child was studying at school, in his reading progress, and in his homework habits. She would provide a specified time and place where the child could do his work, would check on what he did, and would often help him out with his learning problems. In order to keep abreast, she would be in fairly frequent contact with the teacher and the school, would occasionally volunteer her services, and would, if she could, attend workshops on subjects which would help her to help her child.

D. Community Involvement

One of the major goals of the Special Primary Program was to involve the community in the total program. While a concerted effort was made at all schools to implement this objective, the goal was not achieved over and beyond the data reported regarding parental involvement in the program. Only one school was successful in this regard. In this school a board of advisors from the community, as previously noted, was continuously consulted and actively participated in the development of the total school program. It is difficult to measure the community contribution in terms of the Special Primary Program, since it was directed toward the total efforts of the school.

The difficulties encountered by the other schools were reported in various ways. They seemed to take two forms: active resistance and passive apathy. Community persons were either "too busy" or too disinterested or, possibly, too timid to engage themselves in the various school programs.

While these comments cannot be supported quantitatively and are thus interpretative and possibly premature, it would seem basic to consider ways of engaging community groups and members in the overall school program on some sort of partnership basis.

E. Teachers' Perceptions of the Special Primary Program

1. The evaluation procedure. For the purpose of determining how the teachers felt about the services given to their schools as part of the Special Primary Program, a two-part questionnaire was distributed. The first part dealt with the After School Study Center and its influence on student achievements and attitudes in

the day school. The second dealt with teacher attitudes toward other features of the program, such as the smaller registers, the two-teacher classroom, and the need for further training.

In the Special Primary Program, with the exception of one school, only those students in grade two and above were permitted to attend the ASSC. Those below grade two were thought to be too young and immature to benefit from an extended school day. Only the second-grade teachers in each school (36 in all), therefore, were asked their reaction to the ASSC as they perceived it in relation to those of their students who attended. The questions were designed to elicit teacher reaction to several categories: actual improvement in reading or study skills; increased interest in reading or other subjects; attitudinal changes of the child toward his peers, toward his teacher, and toward school in general.

2. Actual improvement in reading or study skills. About one-third of the teachers reported that every one of their students who attended the After School Study Center showed marked improvement in carrying out homework and extra assignments. An additional 32 per cent said that more than half their students showed similar gains. About 30 per cent said there was no appreciable difference.

As for specific reading skills, the majority of teachers felt that most of the students displayed a better grasp of phonics, reading comprehension, and study skills or specific work habits. Also, most of the teachers said that their children (more than half of those attending ASSC) were showing greater interest in reading by seeking books either in or outside the classroom which they were not required to read. This index might well turn out to be a basic measure of the effectiveness of a program such as SPP.

About 75 per cent of the teachers observed an improvement in students' attitudes toward each other and also in their relationships to the teacher. But very few of them could point to any specific attitudinal change. (Only 21 per cent documented their answers with specific examples.)

3. Teachers' needs. In the second part of the questionnaire, teachers were asked how they felt about small groups and how to handle them, about the presence of another teacher in the classroom, and about the areas in which they felt they needed further training. The mean number of years of experience for these teachers was 4.3 years of total experience and 3.6 years in their present school. These means were brought up, however, by the presence of a very few teachers who had been working for a much longer time. In two schools the mean of experience was only 1.8, and in a third school 2.8 years. Those teachers with the least experience welcomed most the presence of another teacher in the classroom and expressed in

more exact terms their need for further training in specific methods as well as in special methods found effective in teaching disadvantaged children.

Two-thirds of the teachers were not bothered by the presence of another teacher in their room. Nevertheless, while they recognized the flexibility made possible by another teacher in the classroom, 86 per cent of them would have preferred to have a class of 15 in their own classroom rather than a total group of 30 shared by two teachers.

The majority of teachers (82 per cent) reported that they had found new techniques for handling small groups. When asked to specify what these techniques were, most of them described the use of individual flash cards and individual reading, made possible by the presence of another adult in the room (either teacher or aide). Ability grouping, fluid seating arrangements, and attention to individual personal problems were also mentioned as techniques made possible by the presence of another teacher, as well as by small groups.

Almost all (94 per cent) said they needed further training for work in disadvantaged areas. Requests for training fell into three categories: specific teaching methods, for example in reading and math; techniques for handling small groups; how to handle discipline problems; and how to identify and work with emotionally disturbed children. These needs might be met in part by: more frequent presentation of demonstration lessons; closer liaison with a non-rating advisor, such as a grade coordinator, to whom they could turn without fear of displaying weakness; and access to psychological and psychiatric consultation. In other words, they were really asking for more on-the-job training, since their college courses had not prepared them for what they had to meet.

4. Evaluation of teacher performance. The Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR) was an instrument first used in the 1966-67 evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment Program,[1] and also used in the evaluation of the Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program.[2] To quote the MES report, "The data . . . suggest that the ILOR produces reliable ratings of the phenomena being observed, despite the lack of any definitions of gradations

---

[1]Fox, David J. Expansion of the Free Choice Open Enrollment Program (New York: Center for Urban Education, September 1967).

[2]Fox, David J. Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program (New York: Center for Urban Education, September 1967).

of quality . . . As to validity, the ILOR can only be defined in terms of the validity of the content." Nevertheless, since it is a tool which was used by over 70 observers in previous studies, the inclusion of it in the present study might ease the way for future comparisons.

The phenomena being investigated were the possible effects of lower class registers on both the teaching process and the learning process. With this in mind, the evaluation team looked for evidence of the teacher's planning, the amount of material covered, the quality and depth of instruction, and the adequate utilization of the small register. In respect to the children, the team wanted to see how they responded in the classroom situation, whether they were able to bring outside experience to bear in the learning process, and whether they could raise spontaneous questions of their own which would show that they were learning to learn.

In each school at least one class in each grade (Pre K to 2) was observed, and in several schools more than one class was seen in each of these grades, a total of 28 class observations, representing about one-fourth of all the classes (22 per cent) at these grade levels in the five SPP day schools.

F. Findings

1. Aspects of teacher functioning. In about half of the 28 classrooms visited there appeared to be a well organized and well planned lesson in progress. These lessons, in a majority of the cases, appeared to be typical of normal classroom activity. Although the observers were expected in the school, the specific classes to be visited were chosen by the observing team after arrival at the school. In another 25 per cent of the classes, it was obvious that some plan was being followed, but there was no evidence of exceptionally good planning. In about 22 per cent of the classes there was some organization and some previous planning, but perhaps a better word to use would be scheduling. Reading, for example, was taken up at a given time, and certain materials were used. Whether the techniques or methods used were built into the plan was not clear.

The overall quality of the lesson was judged by the amount of material covered, the depth of instruction, the effective use of teaching aids, and the creativity or ingenuity of the teacher in developing new materials where inadequate ones existed. The ingenuity of the teacher was judged, in addition to the above mentioned aspects, by her ability to adapt her teaching techniques to small class registers.

In general, the majority of the teachers observed were of average overall ability or above, despite the frequent lack of experience, as indicated by the following figures (based on 36 teachers in grade two):

TABLE 8

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF 36 SECOND GRADE TEACHERS (SPP)

Years of Experience	Per Cent
10 - 20	13
5 - 9	14
3 - 4	20
0 - 2	53

Although these principals deplored the lack of proper training of teachers for work in disadvantaged areas, they suggested that possibly the teachers licensed in Early Childhood were better trained than the others.

Half the teachers (50 per cent) covered an adequate amount of material during the lesson observed, with about 35 per cent doing better than average, and 15 per cent doing less well. In judging depth of instructional material, the proportions shifted somewhat, with only about one-third doing a passable or average job, and one-third performing on an inferior level or below. The percentage of above average or superior performances in this aspect remained more or less the same (33 per cent). The same proportion obtained where the effective use of teaching aids was judged. These and the following details are shown in Table 9.

In the area of creativity (ingenuity) there were about one-third of the teachers in the above average range (although only seven per cent were rated as superior or outstanding). About 25 per cent were noted lacking in this quality.

In 61 per cent of the classes it was noted that the effectiveness of the lesson would have been seriously diminished or rendered useless by the existence of larger classes. One of the reasons for this large proportion perhaps is that in the two-teacher classroom, of which there were many, one of the teachers was frequently able to take just a few children aside to work with them in the areas of their weakness, a situation which would have been impossible to initiate in the ordinary single teacher classroom.

TABLE 9

RATINGS OF ASPECTS OF TEACHER FUNCTIONING[a] FOR ALL FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS (N = 28 CLASSES)

Aspect	% Above Average	% Average	% Below Average
Quality of lesson	54	36	7
Amount of material covered	35	50	15
Depth of lesson	33	33	33
Planning and organization	50	25	22
Creativity and imagination	35	36	25
Use of teaching aids	33	33	33
Utilization of smaller registers	61	18	21
Warmth of teacher-pupil relationship	94	3	3

[a]Where the percentages do not total to 100, it is because, in some classes, the rating of the particular aspect was not relevant.

2. Aspects of children's functioning. Above all, the necessary ingredient for effective teaching, whether or not it was accompanied by experience, was the warm and giving attitude of the teacher toward the class. Where this quality existed - in over 70 per cent of the classrooms[3] - the children seemed to be more responsive to the learning process. On the whole, though, while the children (86 per cent) seemed interested or very interested in the lesson being presented to them, in only 53 per cent of the classes did the children volunteer in response to the questions asked them. In a very small percentage of classes (15 per cent) did any of the

[3]The discrepancy between this 70 per cent and the 94 per cent of the teachers listed in Table 9 is that in some instances there were two teachers in the classroom.

children raise spontaneous questions. The details are presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

RATINGS OF ASPECTS OF CHILDREN'S FUNCTIONING[a] IN FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS (N = 28 CLASSES)

Aspect	% Above Average	% Average	% Below Average
Overall participation of children	82	11	4
Positive overall teacher-pupil relationship	71	4	4
Display of children's interest	50	36	14
Children's spontaneous questions	11	4	64
Volunteering in response to questions asked	42	11	18
Use of child's background	25	40	32

[a]Where the percentages do not total to 100, it is because, in some classes, the rating of the particular aspect was not relevant.

In about two-thirds of the classes (65 per cent) an effort was made to bring in the experience of the child, or relate the material to his background. Only 25 per cent of the teachers were able to use this technique effectively; one-third of them made no such attempt in the lessons observed.

3. The After School Study Center. The After School Study Center (ASSC) was built into the SPP as an extension of the school-day for those children wishing to remain. It was conducted from three to five o'clock on three days a week. Its organization was flexible with the intent of improving achievement and making school more meaningful. Most principals chose to conduct a program including

both remedial classes and clubs. All participants remained for the entire afternoon.

Information about the After School Study (ASSC) was gathered in several ways: by interviews with the principals and their administrative staffs -- to determine the organization plan, enrollment, and teacher allotment; by interviews with teachers; and by direct observation of the classes. Also included in the data is some feedback material from teacher and parent questionnaires.

a. The staff. The size of the staff was increased from seven to a maximum of 20 for each ASSC in the Special Primary Program. All registration was voluntary. A pupil-teacher ratio of 1 to 15 was the goal. Enrollment varied in the different schools (14 per cent to 40 per cent) with about 1,100 participating, out of 2,336 in the five schools. Those who attended with any degree of regularity comprised only 30 per cent to 67 per cent of those enrolled. Thus, of the register of approximately 1,100 in the ASSC of the five schools, only 54 per cent really attended, or only 23 per cent of the total school populations. Therefore, instead of having a pupil-teacher ratio of 1 to 15, the ratio was more likely to average 1 to 8.

In each school the principal was designated as the coordinator of the ASSC, and there was an assistant principal in charge of supervision. The atmosphere in the ASSC tended to reflect the attitude of the principal toward it: where he felt the activity did not serve a useful purpose, the teachers tended to be lackadaisical; where the principal believed the ASSC was a positive factor, the teachers worked vigorously and imaginatively.

There was no difficulty in staffing the ASSC because, for the teachers, extra money was involved. In fact, there was a scramble for these positions and often two teachers shared a class of ten.

b. Assessment of the ASSC Program. As the five SPP schools varied in their day to day functions, so did they differ in creating tools for assessment of the ASSC program. As can be seen in Table 11, the spread was great: from no records of attendance and no other arrangements for reporting back, to periodic questionnaires sent to parents, teachers, and students, and to conferences between day school and ASSC teachers. The more valuable the program seemed to the principal and the administration, the more time and effort the school put into it.

TABLE 11

FEATURES OF THE ASSC IN THE FIVE SPP SCHOOLS

School	Attendance % of Enrollment	Articulation Measures	Admin. Expressed Opinion	Quality of Teaching
E	30	No plans; no attendance taken	Negative	Poor; time-serving
B	30	Report card sent home at end of term	Negative	Uneven; poor to good
C	66	Attendance taken; questionnaire to be sent to parents	Positive	Structured teaching; carefully planned lesson
D	67	Report to day school teachers; notation on child's record	Enthusiastic	Excellent planning; special classes formed
A	66	Teacher, student, parent questionnaires; teacher consultations. Suggestions accepted from Parent-Community Steering Committee	Enthusiastic	Imaginative, zealous, uneven

c. Reactions of teachers and parents. To judge from conversations with teachers (there was at least one interview in depth in each ASSC), although some started out being skeptical about the favorable effects of a lengthened school day, by the end of the year most were convinced that the child's exposure to additional education had helped him. While some cited subject gains, that is, actual improvement beyond expectation in reading skills, others noted shifts in social attitudes which they considered equally important. All felt that the intimate relationship between teacher and pupil, made possible by the low registers, was a major positive force.

The teachers also spoke about the shortcomings of the ASSC. Since the registers were so small, it was frequently impossible to group the children according to grade, and all too often an after-school class was made up of children from grades two to six, thus compounding the difficulties of teaching. Also there was

not enough available material that was different from day school material, and this put an additional burden on a conscientious teacher. Finally, most of them felt that there was not enough central planning for the ASSC. In a sense, every teacher was on his own, and did what he wanted to do.

d. Observations of the program at work. In order to examine the functioning of the ASSC, visits were made to about one-third of the classrooms in the program. The observers sought to find out how the teachers perceived the program, to what extent they were able to create new techniques for small groups, what measure of success was being charted in effecting attitudinal changes as well as changes in subject areas. To this end an observation guide was devised which would help organize impressions (ASSC Observation Guide, contained in Appendix B). After ascertaining the facts (enrollment, attendance, nature of activity, lesson format), the guide focused attention on the teacher's method of work, the planning of the lesson, the use of new materials or the teacher's ingenuity in creating them, the development of new techniques for small groups, and how the teacher felt about the ASSC program.

Observations about subject gains were essentially subjective, since no arrangements had been made in any of the schools to measure concrete gains against comparable achievements in the day schools from which these children were drawn. The same could be said of the attitudinal changes observed by the teachers, which if they took place, did so gradually over a period of time and could not be noticed by an observer, on a single visit, unless called to his attention by the teacher. Reliance in both these matters had to be put on what the teachers said or thought they had achieved. On the other hand, whether the teacher had planned the lesson, whether adequate advantage was being taken of small class size, or whether ingenuity was exercised in the face of inadequate materials was very evident to a trained observer.

Table 12 summarizes information on teacher functioning in the ASSC. The subject matter covered in 45 per cent of the lessons was worthwhile; that is, enough material was covered during the period to support the extra time, money, and energy devoted to it. According to their own reports, 50 per cent of the teachers also managed to shape and modify the attitudes of the children in their charge: the children were less recalcitrant than they had been, and were assuming a more positive attitude toward school and accepted social values. This could perhaps be attributed to the large proportion of teachers (70 per cent) who were perceived by the observation team as being warm and giving, and who had established rapport with their small numbers of children. ("Rapport," it must be remembered, is another difficult thing to measure objectively. The observers could only sense by the reaction of the

student to the teacher that he was accepted, understood, or chastised with affection.)

TABLE 12

ASSESSMENT OF TEACHERS IN ASSC IN ALL FIVE SPP SCHOOLS

N = 24 Classes		Per Cent of Total Classes
Activities carried out	in the form of games or project . .	41
	entirely through tutoring	25
	through formal lessons	34
Organization and plan of activity of lesson	Well planned	42
	Evidence of some planning	25
	No signs of planning	33
Availability of materials different from those in day school	Sufficient	50
	Insufficient	50
Coverage of material: Did it warrant the extra time?	Yes	45
	No	25
	Sometimes	30
Ingenuity of teacher in face of shortages	Positive	46
	Negative	54
Adaptation to small registers	Complete	38
	In many or most instances	38
	None	24
Development of new techniques for small classes	Many new techniques	24
	Individual tutoring	38
	None	38

Questions in the ASSC Observation Guide were also directed to the way the students reacted to the additional tutoring given them. As in the day schools, although children by and large volunteered answers to questions the teacher asked, very few of them raised any spontaneous questions on their own. They were willing to be taught, but were only passively learning. But unlike the day schools, the ASSC was looked forward to by the children because of

its atmosphere of extra curricular activity. Although most of the children were not resistant to the idea of a lengthened school day, the formal learning periods were considered by them to be the necessary prelude to the time of "fun and games" which most of the students anticipated with pleasure. Only a minority (12 per cent) resisted both types of activity.

The single great advantage observed in the ASSC was the intimate contact it afforded between the teacher and the pupil. The fact that the classes were for the most part even smaller than had been anticipated made individual tutoring possible. Most teachers (75 per cent) cited individual tutoring as the source of improvement in subject matter. Indeed, more than one-third of them (38 per cent) considered individual tutoring to be a new technique in the handling of small groups. Only a little more than one-third of the teachers had found other different techniques for small group management: activities in the form of games or contests, or discussions which could make the group move as a unit as well as mark individual progress. About 25 per cent of the teachers made no adaptation at all, treating a class of five or eight as if there were 20 or 30 present, and offering structured lessons as they would have done during regular day-school classes. But on the whole, the After School Study Centers were conducted in an atmosphere much more relaxed than their day-school counterparts, and this in itself seemed to make a difference to the children.

Variations in the organization of the ASSC, teaching methods employed (clubs or classes), the way in which refreshment periods were handled (from no refreshments at all to up to 45 minutes' time consumed in "snacks"), the proportion of pupils who attended (from one-third to two-thirds of the enrollment) -- all these variations were tremendous from school to school. In addition, there were few objective measures which could be used to judge the success of the program in terms of achievement. No school had set up a control program in the day school; and only one school had prepared questionnaires to go to the day-school teachers for the purpose of checking the progress of the pupil.

The intangibles within the program were impossible to measure and difficult to assess. Yet more than half the parents and 75 per cent of the teachers thought the program was fruitful and worthwhile.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The quantitative findings of no systematic differences emerging between performance in the five Special Primary Program schools and the several baseline, comparison schools, while clear, are neither definitive nor conclusive. The qualitative outcomes and their interpretation suggest definite advantages potentially accruing to the facilities and set-up of the Special Primary Program, including the ASSC. It seems a tenable hypothesis that, all other things being equal, including the teacher, the smaller the class group the greater will be the behavioral change, academically, culturally, and socially. Thus it would seem -- almost by definition -- that the Special Primary Program is "working" in this sense. There is, however, one large qualifier, namely, that the measurements taken be appropriate to the behavioral changes introduced and induced by the intervention program.

Comments, recommendations, suggestions for future work in this area, and conclusions from the current findings follow.

1. The Special Primary Program per se, even though an overlay and distillation of other programs, has been in effect only about nine months. From a research standpoint, one can hardly demand definitive results from a complex program after such a short period. Intervention programs must be examined in the long view, say, over a three- to five-year period. This point implies in the present context an extension of both intervention and assessment to grades five and possibly beyond.

2. On the methods used for evaluation, a need exists for clarification and definition of the specific details of the program in terms of (a) extent and method of research; (b) administrative implementation; (c) the evaluations of those directly involved, namely, school personnel, particularly teachers; and (d) the role of the parents. Without these detailed specifications, it is not at all obvious how the goals of the program can be achieved; far less, how rigorous evaluation can be conducted.

Such matters as appropriate before-and-after measurements are essentials in a program like this. Equating of groups is also fundamental if the effects of several simultaneously operating programs are to be disentangled and "deconfounded." It would seem that careful research planning beforehand with heavy concentration on not more than two schools might well be advisable for future evaluation.

3. A number of questions arise concerning the nature of the measuring instruments applied. The ones available stressed academic achievement, which is only one face of a many faceted die. There are specific questions about the appropriateness of the instruments themselves. For instance, several principals indicated independently that the children were being tested for the meaning of a large number of words to which they had never been exposed. A test for specific learned responses to specific stimuli obviously should present only previously experienced stimulus materials. In this sense, these tests fell far short of measuring achievement.

4. The overall aim of the project should be clearly stated: instilling in the child the habit of learning-to-learn. If the purpose of education is to instill in the child a habit of seeking knowledge -- call it "motivation" or whatever -- then intervention programs should concentrate on teaching this generalized habit pattern. Assessment and evaluation by this token would focus on examination of the degree to which the child's learning-to-learn habits carry over, transfer, or generalize beyond the classroom situation. From a research standpoint it is basic that this direction be taken by such intervention programs as that under evaluative scrutiny.

5. Overall planning is indicated for better utilization of parent and community resources to realize the full potential of this program.

6. A reservoir of trained personnel is needed to fill the roles of specialists and members of clinical teams. The inability to find and recruit appropriate personnel for many budgeted positions was a serious handicap to the program.

7. A future evaluation might include a study of the specific effects of attendance at the ASSC program on the achievement and attitudes of pupils.

8. With the modifications and alterations suggested, it is strongly recommended that the Special Primary Program be continued.

APPENDIX A

(Tables included in the text)

APPENDIX B

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
Special Primary Program
Pre-Kindergarten - 2nd Grade

INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT

School_____ Borough_____ Grade_____ Class_____ Date_____

Teacher's Name_____ Sex_____ Observer_____

Length of Class Observation_____ Activities Observed_____

1. How would you describe the teacher's overall handling of the children's spontaneous questions?

    1. Questions were welcomed and built on.
    2. Questions were answered cursorily.
    3. Questions were ignored.
    4. Opportunity for spontaneous questions was there but few or none were asked. Why?_____
    5. Not relevant. Explain:

    _____

2. What was the overall participation of children?

    1. Every or almost every child was actively involved.
    2. More than half participated.
    3. About half participated.
    4. Fewer than half participated.
    5. Very few or none participated.
    6. Not relevant. Explain:_____

3. What was the children's general understanding of the teacher's spoken word?

    1. Every or almost every child understood fully.
    2. More than half understood.
    3. About half the children understood fully.
    4. Less than half the children understood.
    5. Very few or no children understood

4. How would you describe the overall verbal fluency of the children who participated?

    1. Articulated clearly with correct grammar.
    2. Articulated clearly with some grammatical errors.
    3. Articulated clearly with many grammatical errors.
    4. Articulated indistinctly with correct grammar.
    5. Articulated indistinctly with some grammatical errors.
    6. Articulated indistinctly with many grammatical errors.
    7. Not relevant. Explain:

    _____

5. How would you describe the verbal communication among the children?

1. Articulated clearly with correct grammar.
2. Articulated clearly with some grammatical errors.
3. Articulated clearly with many grammatical errors.
4. Articulated indistinctly with correct grammar.
5. Articulated indistinctly with some grammatical errors.
6. Articulated indistinctly with many grammatical errors.
7. Not relevant. Explain: _____

6. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with the children?

1. Always or almost always spoke to the children on their level of understanding.
2. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding more than half the time.
3. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding about half the time.
4. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding less than half the time.
5. Seldom or never spoke to the children on their level of understanding.

7. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with Non-English speaking children?

1. Communicates with ease.
2. Communicates with some difficulty.
3. Communicates with great difficulty.
4. Not relevant. Explain: _____

8. How would you describe the overall relationship among the children?

1. All or almost all the children seem to get along well with others as a total class.
2. All or almost all the children seem to get along well with some of the others with evidence of small social cliques.
3. More than half of the children seem to get along well with others.
4. About half the children seem to get along well with others.
5. Less than half the children seem to get along well with others.
6. Very few or no children seem to get along well with others.

9. How would you describe the overall Teacher-Pupil relationship?

1. Teacher seems to get along well with all or almost all the pupils.
2. Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, ignoring the rest.
3. Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, and shows an overt distaste for some.
4. Teacher seems to get along well with about half the pupils.
5. Teacher seems to get along well with less than half the pupils.
6. Teacher seems to get along well with very few or none of the pupils.

10. How would you rate the overall quality of instruction?

1. Outstanding.
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor

11. How would you rate the classroom's appearance?

1. Extremely attractive
2. Of greater than average attractiveness
3. Average
4. Less than average attractiveness
5. Unattractive

Additional observation_____

_____

12. How would you describe the classroom atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth?

1. Undisciplined and warm
2. Undisciplined and cold
3. Disciplined yet congenial or warm
4. Disciplined and cold
5. Overdisciplined yet warm
6. Overdisciplined and cold

Additional comments:

School_____Borough_____Class_____Observer_____

Activity_____

Conducted from (time)_____to_____

13. Who conducted this activity?

1. Regular classroom teacher
2. Cluster teacher
3. Substitute teacher
4. Special staff (indicate who)_____
5. Other (indicate who)_____

14. Approximate number of children in teaching unit_____

a) If less than total class, what were others doing?_____

_____

15. How typical do you think this activity was of normal classroom functioning?

1. Completely typical
2. Reasonable approximation
3. Atypical Explain:_____

16. Amount of planning and organization evident in this activity?

1. Exceptionally well organized and planned.
2. Well organized and planned but not exceptionally so.
3. Well organized and showed some evidence of planning.
4. Not organized but showed some signs of previous teacher planning.
5. Showed few or no signs of organization or planning.

17. Was concept development employed? Explain.

1. Yes
2. No

Explain: _____

_____

18. Level of creativity and imagination evident in this activity.

    1. Extremely creative
    2. Predominately creative
    3. Equally creative and stereotyped
    4. More stereotyped than creative
    5. Extremely stereotyped

19. If you rated the activity as "extremely" creative, or "predominately" creative, please explain why.

    _____

    _____

20. Use of the children's background and experience evident in this activity?

    1. Consistent opportunities for children to relate activity to their own background.
    2. Consistent opportunities for children to bring experience to activity.
    3. Some opportunity for children to relate activity to their own background.
    4. Some opportunity for children to use experience in activity.
    5. Activity was remote from children's experience.
    6. Not relevant. Explain: _____

21. To what extent, and how effectively were teaching aids utilized?

    1. Wide variety used and used creatively and effectively.
    2. Wide variety used but not particularly effectively.
    3. Some used and used creatively and effectively.
    4. Some used but not particularly effectively.
    5. Little or no use of teaching aids.
    6. Not relevant. Explain: _____

22. Amount of material covered?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor
    6. Not relevant. Explain: _____

23. How would you rate the depth of instruction?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor
6. Not relevant. Explain:_____

24. How many children showed interest and enthusiasm?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half of the children.
3. Half of the children.
4. Fewer than half of the children.
5. Few or no children.
6. Not relevant. Explain:_____

25. How many children raised spontaneous questions?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half the children.
3. About half the children.
4. Fewer than half the children.
5. Few or no children.

26. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half the children.
3. About half the children.
4. Fewer than half the children.
5. Very few or no children.
6. Not relevant. Explain:_____

27. Had this activity been duplicated with a class size of 30-35, what would have happened to its effectiveness?

1. Larger class would have completely destroyed effecti eness.
2. Larger class size would have seriously impeded effectiveness.
3. Activity would have been somewhat less effective in a larger class
4. There would have been no loss of effectiveness.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Special Primary Program

Teacher Questionnaire

Title 1 Evaluation

To the teachers:

We should like to enlist your aid in evaluating the extent to which the After School Study Center and the Special Primary Program are helping the individual children in your class. We would appreciate your answering the following questions to the best of your knowledge. Your replies will be held in complete confidence.

1. How many children are registered in your class? _____

2. How many children in your class attend the ASSC? _____

<u>For those children who attend the ASSC</u>:

3. About how many are more actively seeking books in the classroom or outside of school? _____

4. About how many are more actively participating in reading and related activities? _____

5. About how many are showing reading improvement in terms of

   a) Phonics _____

   b) Comprehension _____

   c) Study skills _____

6. How many have shown improved relationship with peers? _____

7. About how many have shown improved relationship with teachers? _____

8. About how many have shown improvement in carrying out assignments either in or outside of school? _____

9. About how many have shown any evidence of finding new interests as a result of attending ASSC (e.g., in science or in art)? _____

10. Have you noticed any attitudinal changes? Please illustrate.

11. Do you have any suggestions as to how the ASSC might better improve the child's work during the day? Please explain.

12. How many years of experience have you had in primary school education? _____

13. How many years of experience have you had in teaching disadvantaged children? _____

14. How many years of teaching have you had in this school? _____

	yes	no
15. Have you been able to find new techniques this year for handling your class in small groups?		
16. If so, please describe one of them briefly.		
17. Is the presence of another teacher in your classroom a hindrance?		
18. Would you rather conduct a class of 15 or 20 by yourself?		
19. Does the supervision that you receive encompass so much that it interferes with your creativity?		
20. Would you welcome further training involving the teaching of the disadvantaged?		

21. What training do you think would be helpful to you in your teaching? Or what specific help would you like to have?

22. Do you have any other general comments or suggestions?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Special Primary Program

Parent Inventory

1. Do you work in the school in any capacity - as an aide, or cafeteria worker - for a salary?

   Yes_____ No_____

2. Have you volunteered your services to the school at least once?

   Yes_____ No_____

3. How many of your children go to this school at the present time?

   _____

4. How many times during the term have you been in touch with your child's teacher or principal, either through letters sent home, or through personal contact?

   Not at all_____ Once a month_____ Once a week_____
   More than 15 times_____

5. Have you attended or do you attend a Parents' Workshop?

   Yes_____ On what subject_____
   No _____

6. Does your child attend the After School Study Center?

   Yes_____ No_____

7. If he does attend, do you feel that this has helped your child in his regular daytime studies?

   Very much_____ A little_____ Not at all_____

8. Have you been asked to check, or do you check, his homework?

   Yes_____ No_____

9. Have you been able to provide, or do you provide, a regular time and place for him to do his homework?

   Yes_____ No_____

10. About his homework: do you think he is given

Too much_____ Too little_____ Enough_____

11. Have you been invited to any meetings which would plan to tell you what your child is being taught and how? Please give details.

_____

_____

12. Have you been able to help your child with his homework?

Yes_____ No_____ Sometimes_____

13. Have you been asked to find out what is being taught and how, so that you can help him?

Yes_____ No_____

14. Do you think it is proper for a parent to be asked to help to teach his child?

Yes_____ No_____ Sometimes_____

15. Do you think all teaching (of reading, writing, arithmetic, etc.) should be left completely to the teacher?

Yes_____ No_____

16. Have you any suggestions which you think might improve the running of the After School Study Center?

Special Primary Program in Five Schools

Outline of Principal's or Assistant Principal's Report

1. How much staff was allotted? How much did the school receive? (Check figures given across the board in the project proposal budget.)

2. What other special programs exist in the school?

3. The technical set-up

   a) In what grades does the program put greatest emphasis?

   b) How many classes are there in each grade? How large are the classes?

Pre K	3
K	4
1	5
2	6

   c) What is the register of the school? How mobile is its population?

   d) What is the ethnic composition?

   Negro - Puerto Rican - Other -

4. Staff

   a) How many teachers are there per class? How do they function?

   Cluster Team teaching Subject specialists

   b) How many school aides, teacher aides, or other paraprofessionals?

   What is their function?

   c) How was the additional staff selected? What provision has been made for their special training?

      1) Assistant Principal
      2) Grade Coordinator
      3) Administrator and Secretary
      4) Teachers
      5) Aides

5. Grade Coordinators

   a) How many are there? For which grades?

   b) What proportion of their time is devoted to

      1) Teaching?
      2) Planning and coordinating instructional and other materials?
      3) Conducting meetings? What kind of meetings?
      4) Training teachers?
      5) Maintaining liaison with other grades?

6. Guidance counselor

   a) How does he function

      1) with the maladjusted child?
      2) with the faculty?
      3) with the community?

7. Clinical team psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker

   a) Does the school have its quota?
   b) How much time per week does each give to the Special Primary Program?
   c) What special use is being made of these increased services?

8. The Community Relations Counselor

   a) What is his role?
   b) How successful has he been thus far?

9. Involvement of Parents

   a) How frequently are parents' meetings held?
      How many attend?
   b) How do parents aid in the reading program?
   c) Are they used in any volunteer capacity?
   d) Are there parent workshops organized in the school? On what subjects?
   e) Are there other parent activities?

10. What is the nature of the school's involvement with the community?

11. In the Special Primary Program what constitutes cultural enrichment?

12. After School Study Center

   a) How many children are in attendance? Is attendance voluntary?

   b) How many teachers should there be? How many are there?

   c) How effective is the remedial program?

After School Study Center

Special Primary Program

The Figures

1. What is the school register?
2. What is the register of the ASSC?
   a) How many from pre-K - 2?
   b) How many from 3 - 6?
3. Is attendance voluntary?
4. How many actually attend?

The Program

1. How is it created and supervised?
   a) Board of Education
   b) District Superintendent's office
   c) School principal
   d) Teacher-in-Charge
   e) Individual instructor
2. What is its content?
   a) Remedial Reading
   b) Remedial Arithmetic
   c) Cultural Enrichment
      How is this achieved?
3. In what way is this ASSC different from last year's after school program?
   a) attendance
   b) instruction
   c) enrichment
   d) additional materials
   e) general atmosphere

After School Study Center

Special Primary Program

The Figures

1. What is the school register?
2. What is the register of the ASSC?
   a) How many from pre-K - 2?
   b) How many from 3 - 6?
3. Is attendance voluntary?
4. How many actually attend?

The Program

1. How is it created and supervised?
   a) Board of Education
   b) District Superintendent's office
   c) School principal
   d) Teacher-in-Charge
   e) Individual instructor
2. What is its content?
   a) Remedial Reading
   b) Remedial Arithmetic
   c) Cultural Enrichment
      How is this achieved?
3. In what way is this ASSC different from last year's after school program?
   a) attendance
   b) instruction
   c) enrichment
   d) additional materials
   e) general atmosphere

4. What provisions have been made for testing the effectiveness of the program?

    a) ASSC testing program

    b) Day school testing program

    c) Teacher questionnaire

    d) Student questionnaire

    e) Parent questionnaire

5. In what way have the parents been involved?

    a) Through observation of ASSC

    b) Through volunteer work

    c) Through employment as aides or instructors

    d) Through workshops

    e) Through student progress reports

The Staff

Individual observation/interview

1. How many children are in the class? How many are registered?

2. How do they respond? Are they

    a) Enjoying

    b) Learning

    c) Marking time

    d) Creating discipline problems

3. Is the teacher taking special advantage of the small registers?

    a) Are the materials different from those used in day school?

    b) Is the lesson structured as it would be in a classroom?

    c) Has the teacher mastered the techniques of small classroom management?

d) Does the teacher communicate

1) enthusiasm and warmth

2) a business-like attitude toward a necessary task

3) a laissez-faire attitude

4. Has the teacher agreed to work because

a) he needs the money

b) he believes his services will benefit the school population

c) he has been drafted

After School Study Center
Observation
Special Primary Program in Five Schools

School_____ Date_____

Teacher_____ _____
(Auxiliary Help)

1. How many were registered? _____

   How many were present? _____

2. Activities observed:

3. How were these activities carried out:

   a. As regular classroom lessons?
   b. In the form of games?
   c. In the form of projects?
   d. Through individual tutoring?

4. Did the children seem to feel:

   a. That there was pressure on them to learn?
   b. That they were there merely to relax and enjoy?
   c. Unwilling to do either?

5. Were there enough materials available different from day school?

   _____Yes _____No

6. Did the teacher show ingenuity or initiative in creating materials or a variety of activities for the class?

   _____Yes _____No

7. Did the teacher show:

   a. Enthusiasm, warmth, and competence?
   b. Competence in performance of duty?
   c. Ineptness?

8. Did the amount of subject material covered warrant the additional time devoted to it?

   _____Yes _____No

9. Did the amount of subjective material (attitudes, neutralization of antisocial behavior, etc.) warrant the time spent?

   _____Yes _____No

10. Was the teacher able to adapt to the smaller register so as to make maximum use of it?
    a. Completely? b. In many or most instances? c. Not at all?

SCALE M: MOTOR DEVELOPMENT

Age Level Three

__ 1. Goes down stairs alone; probably with same foot leading on each step.
__ 2. Climbs, swings, jumps, slides; uses playground apparatus.*
__ 3. Hammers peg in hole with wooden mallet.
__ 4. Strings one-inch wooden beads on shoelace.
__ 5. Scribbles with crayon; probably grasps crayon in fist.

Age Level Four

__ 6. Descends stairs, feet alternating; may need support of railing or adult's hand.
__ 7. Runs nimbly, turns corners easily, stops readily.
__ 8. Skips; may drag one foot.
__ 9. Carries cup of water, three-quarters filled, without spilling.
__10. Places large blocks to erect simple facades of houses, boats, etc.*

Age Level Five

__11. Goes up and down stairs, feet alternating, without need for holding railing or adult's hand.
__12. Runs, jumps, gallops, sways in time to music.
__13. Skips, using feet alternately.
__14. Places large blocks to make surface plans have right angles; e.g., floor plans of a house.*
__15. Cuts and pastes simple forms.

Age Level Six

__16. Controls direction and speed of running as in games like *tag, squirrel in the tree.**
__17. Throws ball overhand, shifting weight from one foot to the other.
__18. Places blocks with precision and alignment to make complicated three-dimensional structures.*
__19. Holds pencil in fingers in adult fashion; grip may be tense.
__20. Draws from model a true likeness of a three- or four-sided straight line figure.*

Age Level Seven

__21. Bounces and catches ball with one hand.
__22. Executes series of controlled movements as in hopscotch, ball-bouncing routines, ball games.*
__23. Uses simple tools to make recognizable articles from cardboard, drawing paper, cloth, etc.
__24. Ties firm knot and bow, as in shoelaces.
__25. Writes a few simple words without model; spelling may be incorrect.

Age Level Eight

__26. Has gross body control as in balancing and jumping from heights, climbing or performing simple stunts.*
__27. Throws a ball with fair aim.*
__28. Makes well constructed usable objects in woodwork, arts and crafts.
__29. Shows dexterity in fine hand movements as in carving, sewing, weaving.
__30. Shows ease in writing movements; hold on pencil is not unduly tense.

---

* See Manual of Directions, page 7, for additional details.

(Reprinted by permission of the Office of Educational Research of the Board of Education of the City of New York).

SCALE B: INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

Age Level Three

__ 1. Has attained consciousness of self; thinks and talks mostly in terms of *I* or *me*.
__ 2. Begins to play with, rather than alongside of another child.
__ 3. Begins to take turns if waiting period is short, but may frequently hit, grab, push to get what he wants.
__ 4. With adult guidance, begins to share, but may frequently cry, hit, have temper tantrums when deprived of what he wants.
__ 5. Takes role of animals or people in dramatic play.

Age Level Four

__ 6. Plays cooperatively with another child; there is definite although not necessarily continuous interaction between them.*
__ 7. Seeks status in group; may do this by giving outstanding performance or by bragging or showing off.
__ 8. Uses spoken requests to get what he wants, although hitting and snatching may still be frequent.
__ 9. Generally accepts an alternative for something he wants and cannot have.*
__ 10. Suggests taking turns, although may not carry through the process consistently.

Age Level Five

__ 11. Plays cooperatively with a group of two to five children; interaction is not necessarily continuous.*
__ 12. Sustains for long period interest in dramatic play with others.
__ 13. Comforts other children when they cry or have been hurt.
__ 14. Shares tools and equipment voluntarily with others within organized work group.
__ 15. Expresses anger; form of expression begins to be verbal rather than physical.*

Age Level Six

__ 16. Plays group games with simple structure and rules, as in *tag, jump rope.*
__ 17. Expresses anger, usually in words rather than physically.
__ 18. Takes initiative in helping younger or less able children in classroom routines.
__ 19. Re-enacts in detail the functions of neighborhood workers—the policeman, garbageman, grocer, laundryman, etc.*
__ 20. Notices and makes comments about the contributions and productions of other children.*

Age Level Seven

__ 21. Shows loyalty to a small group of children; chooses its members for voluntary group activities.
__ 22. Adheres strictly to group-made rules of conduct for games or classroom activities; will not tolerate exceptions.
__ 23. Evaluates criticisms by other children and accepts constructive suggestions.*
__ 24. Expresses common adult opinions about personalities in the news.
__ 25. Re-enacts role of adult hero or heroine in narrative sequences drawn from stories or motion pictures.

Age Level Eight

__ 26. Participates in group games with definite rules and rather involved relationships as in baseball, punchball, or as in table games like *parchesi, pick-up-sticks.*
__ 27. Understands need for the simpler social courtesies and generally uses them without teacher reminder.*
__ 28. Begins to consider approval and opinions of other children of major importance in guiding behavior.*
__ 29. Shows social consciousness in seeing similarities between himself and child of different background.*
__ 30. Judges critically the capabilities of other children in selecting them for special jobs.

---

* See Manual of Directions, page 6, for additional details.

SCALE L: LANGUAGE

Age Level Three

__ 1. Articulates in understandable but infantile manner.*
__ 2. Begins to talk in short sentences (three or four words); grammatical structure may be poor.*
__ 3. Keeps up a continuous monologue regarding the things he sees and does.*
__ 4. Asks *What's that? What's your name?* repeats answer until he has added new word to his vocabulary.*
__ 5. Relates incidents in simple terms with few details.*

Age Level Four

__ 6. Uses sentences averaging five or six words; grammatical structure may be poor.*
__ 7. Plays with sounds; makes up nonsense words and rhymed syllables.*
__ 8. Uses numbers without necessarily understanding their meaning.*
__ 9. Asks *How?* and *Why?* repeatedly, more to establish relationship with the adult than to obtain information.
__10. Talks to other children; probably does not expect a reply.*

Age Level Five

__11. Articulates clearly all sounds; possible exceptions *th, zh, wh,* triple consonants like *str, sts.**
__12. Reports in some detail events recently experienced or witnessed.*
__13. Adapts his language to role of mother, father, etc. in dramatic play.
__14. Recognizes and gives correct name for common colors.
__15. Asks questions for the definite purpose of obtaining information.*

Age Level Six

__16. Uses fairly accurate grammatical forms.*
__17. Uses some compound and some complex sentences.*
__18. Uses polysyllabic words such as *elevator, apologize.*
__19. Retells a complete story like *The Three Little Pigs* or *Goldilocks* with events in sequence.
__20. Adjusts his language to fit roles of storybook characters in unrehearsed dramatizations.

Age Level Seven

__21. Has mastered the mechanics of articulation.*
__22. Uses sentences with grammatical structure roughly approximating that of the adult; uses all parts of speech.
__23. Contributes to interchange of ideas in sustained conversation.*
__24. Is aware of humorous possibilities and double meanings of words; enjoys puns.*
__25. Uses idiomatic expressions such as *raining cats and dogs, get a wiggle on, clear as mud.*

Age Level Eight

__26. Uses some current slang, technical or specialized terms.
__27. Gives meanings of words in descriptive terms.*
__28. Participates in discussion and defends his point of view.*
__29. Shows beginning appreciation of abstract ideas in conversation.*
__30. Sees new interpretations or several meanings in familiar words.*

---

* See Manual of Directions, page 6, for additional details.

SCALE M: MOTOR DEVELOPMENT

Age Level Three

__ 1. Goes down stairs alone; probably with same foot leading on each step.
__ 2. Climbs, swings, jumps, slides; uses playground apparatus.*
__ 3. Hammers peg in hole with wooden mallet.
__ 4. Strings one-inch wooden beads on shoelace.
__ 5. Scribbles with crayon; probably grasps crayon in fist.

Age Level Four

__ 6. Descends stairs, feet alternating; may need support of railing or adult's hand.
__ 7. Runs nimbly, turns corners easily, stops readily.
__ 8. Skips; may drag one foot.
__ 9. Carries cup of water, three-quarters filled, without spilling.
__10. Places large blocks to erect simple facades of houses, boats, etc.*

Age Level Five

__11. Goes up and down stairs, feet alternating, without need for holding railing or adult's hand.
__12. Runs, jumps, gallops, sways in time to music.
__13. Skips, using feet alternately.
__14. Places large blocks to make surface plans have right angles; e.g., floor plans of a house.*
__15. Cuts and pastes simple forms.

Age Level Six

__16. Controls direction and speed of running as in games like *tag, squirrel in the tree.**
__17. Throws ball overhand, shifting weight from one foot to the other.
__18. Places blocks with precision and alignment to make complicated three-dimensional structures.*
__19. Holds pencil in fingers in adult fashion; grip may be tense.
__20. Draws from model a true likeness of a three- or four-sided straight line figure.*

Age Level Seven

__21. Bounces and catches ball with one hand.
__22. Executes series of controlled movements as in hopscotch, ball-bouncing routines, ball games.*
__23. Uses simple tools to make recognizable articles from cardboard, drawing paper, cloth, etc.
__24. Ties firm knot and bow, as in shoelaces.
__25. Writes a few simple words without model; spelling may be incorrect.

Age Level Eight

__26. Has gross body control as in balancing and jumping from heights, climbing or performing simple stunts.*
__27. Throws a ball with fair aim.*
__28. Makes well constructed usable objects in woodwork, arts and crafts.
__29. Shows dexterity in fine hand movements as in carving, sewing, weaving.
__30. Shows ease in writing movements; hold on pencil is not unduly tense.

---

* See Manual of Directions, page 7, for additional details.

APPENDIX C

Staff List

Dr. William O. Jenkins, Evaluation Director
Professor of Psychology
Queens College of
The City University of New York
Consultant,
Center for Urban Education

Mrs. Edna M. Phillips, Assoc. Evaluation Director
Consultant
New York City Board of Education
and Center for Urban Education

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
ESEA TITLE I EVALUATIONS

SUMMARY REPORT

Date: October 1968

Project: Special Primary Programs in Five Schools
(06E68)

Evaluation Director: Dr. William O. Jenkins
Professor of Psychology
Queens College of
The City University of New York
Consultant, Center for Urban Education

Mrs. Edna M. Phillips, Assoc. Evaluation Director
Consultant
New York City Board of Education
and Center for Urban Education

No significant differences emerged on the three quantitative measuring instruments between the five Special Primary Program schools and the comparison schools selected to be equivalent in geographical location and ethnic composition. Furthermore, no systematic trends of any kind were detectable. Of course, wide variation appeared within and across schools.

One clearcut finding was the failure of most children to achieve at grade level on the quantitative tests. In all instances where the measurements were taken, less than 20 per cent achieved at the appropriate grade level. Some questions arose concerning the validity of certain measures. For instance, in one case less than 50 per cent of the vocabulary words taught appeared on the test.

Several basic factors were considered as contaminating the research design. These included: the lack of any pretesting as a baseline for the statistical examination of gain scores; the combined impacts of pupil mobility and teacher turnover on the assessment of achievement; and the confounding caused by the simultaneous operation of several programs, making it difficult to attribute any effects to one specific program.

Duration of stay in school was found to be positively correlated with test performance. There was a clearcut trend for children who had been in the same school for a longer period to score higher on the tests than children who had attended for shorter periods.

The administrative staff, in particular the principals, agreed that greater clarification and communication was needed in the Special Primary Program. The addition of assistant principals and grade coordinators greatly facilitated the program of the schools in the view of the administrative staff. They reported considerable difficulty in achieving parental and community participation, but stressed these matters as integral goals of the program. Space limitations involved in the assignment of two teachers to one classroom interferred with the full implementation of the team-teaching principle. They also reported a pressing need for the clinical team personnel who were often not available. They felt that the lowered registers played a substantial role in improving social and emotional behavior. The teachers independently concurred in these conclusions and interpretations regarding the Special Primary Program.

The teachers reported an improvement in students' attitudes toward and relationships with one another and the teachers themselves. They welcomed the smaller registers and reported decided teaching advantages to working with smaller groups. They reported some interference from two teachers in one room, but favored the team-teaching approach under better physical arrangements. The teachers as a group felt the need for further training for work in disadvantaged areas. The grade coordinators played a considerable role in helping to fill this gap.

No significant differences emerged on the three quantitative measuring instruments between the five Special Primary Program schools and the comparison schools selected to be equivalent in geographical location and ethnic composition. Furthermore, no systematic trends of any kind were detectable. Of course, wide variation appeared within and across schools.

One clearcut finding was the failure of most children to achieve at grade level on the quantitative tests. In all instances where the measurements were taken, less than 20 per cent achieved at the appropriate grade level. Some questions arose concerning the validity of certain measures. For instance, in one case less than 50 per cent of the vocabulary words taught appeared on the test.

Several basic factors were considered as contaminating the research design. These included: the lack of any pretesting as a baseline for the statistical examination of gain scores; the combined impacts of pupil mobility and teacher turnover on the assessment of achievement; and the confounding caused by the simultaneous operation of several programs, making it difficult to attribute any effects to one specific program.

Duration of stay in school was found to be positively correlated with test performance. There was a clearcut trend for children who had been in the same school for a longer period to score higher on the tests than children who had attended for shorter periods.

The administrative staff, in particular the principals, agreed that greater clarification and communication was needed in the Special Primary Program. The addition of assistant principals and grade coordinators greatly facilitated the program of the schools in the view of the administrative staff. They reported considerable difficulty in achieving parental and community participation, but stressed these matters as integral goals of the program. Space limitations involved in the assignment of two teachers to one classroom interferred with the full implementation of the team-teaching principle. They also reported a pressing need for the clinical team personnel who were often not available. They felt that the lowered registers played a substantial role in improving social and emotional behavior. The teachers independently concurred in these conclusions and interpretations regarding the Special Primary Program.

The teachers reported an improvement in students' attitudes toward and relationships with one another and the teachers themselves. They welcomed the smaller registers and reported decided teaching advantages to working with smaller groups. They reported some interference from two teachers in one room, but favored the team-teaching approach under better physical arrangements. The teachers as a group felt the need for further training for work in disadvantaged areas. The grade coordinators played a considerable role in helping to fill this gap.

Observations of teacher performance revealed 50 per cent or more rated above average in quality of lesson planning and organization, utilization of smaller registers, and warmth of teacher-pupil relationships. The areas for greatest improvement lay in depth of lesson, use of teaching aids, and creativity and imagination. There was observational evidence of child improvement, but no comparison information was available from nonprogram schools.

There was some disparity of opinion regarding the ASSC program. Some principals thought the increased school day for young children might lead to fatigue rather than increased learning. Others reported appreciable training benefits. These attitudes were reflected in the conduct of the ASSC program at the several schools. The teachers in both the ASSC program itself and in the regular day school reported noting improvements in reading skills and social attitudes among their ASSC pupils. These changes were attributed by the teachers to the small registers of the ASSC. Observations of the ASSC program in action yielded wide variation from school to school, but provided supportive evidence for child improvement. The benefits seemed to accrue from the intimate contact between pupil and teacher in the ASSC.

A number of design problems are discussed in detail. The need for building in rigorous research design at the planning stages is stressed. The importance of control groups is treated along with the need for a wide variety of measurements taken before, during, and after treatment as in standard transfer of training research. Long-range assessment over a period of several years is indicated. The contaminating effects of confounding and pupil mobility must be dealt with if a precise research design is to be achieved. It is emphasized that the essence of early educational intervention should deal with the habit of "learning-to-learn" and the correlated concepts of transfer and generalization. Put another way, an early intervention program should inculcate and ingrain in the child a habit pattern of seeking knowledge both in and out of the classroom. The assessment should focus on the extent of transfer of the hierarchy of habits making up the concept of learning to learn. The basic issue is the extent to which "learning set" generalizes beyond the specific situation in which it is learned. This point constitutes the ultimate criterion of the effectiveness of any intervention program.

The program purposes are being worked toward, but it would be premature to say they are being achieved. Without appreciable refinement in design and measurement, along the lines suggested, the actual benefits to the children in acquisition of knowledge are difficult to assess. There is a suggestion that child behavior is changing socially and attitudinally, but these matters were not directly measured. The staff -- administrative and teaching -- are working toward program objectives, but without improvement in research technique, definitive answers regarding the effectiveness of the program cannot be provided. There is certainly a pressing need for personnel for clinical teams and far greater involvement and participation

by parents and community members. The ASSC seems to be having an appreciable impact upon child behavior and opinion strongly supports it, but in the absence of valid measurement, conclusions are at best tenuous.

Marked modification is called for in the way of greatly improved design and measurement in the context of long-range planning. The current state and progress of the Special Primary Program warrants a strong recommendation for its continuation.